

Change Proposal

Amendment to RGMA Validation Rules for Meter Asset Installation Date

CDSP Reference: XRN4534

Document Stage	Version	Date	Author	Status
ROM Request / Change Proposal	0.1	20/11/2017	Andrew Margan	Submitted to Change Committee
ROM Response				Choose an item.
Change Management Committee Outcome	0.1	10/01/2018	Xoserve	Approved by Change Committee
EQR				Choose an item.
Change Management Committee Outcome				Choose an item.
BER				Choose an item.
Change Management Committee Outcome				Choose an item.
CCR				Choose an item.
Change Management Committee Outcome				Choose an item.

Document Purpose

This document is intended to provide a single view of a change as it moves through the change journey. The document is constructed in a way that enables each section to build upon the details entered in the preceding section. The level of detail is built up in an incremental manner as the project progresses.

The template is aligned to the Change Management Procedures, as defined in the CDSP Service Document. The template is designed to remove the need for duplication of information. Where information is required in one section but has been previously captured in a previous section, the previous section will be referenced.

The summary table on the front page shows the history and the current status of the Change Proposal.

Section	Title	Responsibility
1	Proposed Change	Proposer / Mod Panel
2	ROM Request / Change Proposal	Proposer / Mod Panel
3	ROM Request Rejection	CDSP
4	Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Analysis	CDSP
5	Change Proposal: Committee Outcome	Change Management Committee
6	EQR: Change Proposal Rejection	CDSP
7	Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Notification of delivery date	CDSP
8	Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR)	CDSP
9	Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Committee Outcome	Change Management Committee
10	Business Evaluation Report (BER)	CDSP
11	Business Evaluation Report (BER): Committee Outcome	Change Management Committee
12	Change Completion Report (CCR)	CDSP
13	Change Completion Report (CCR): Committee Outcome	Change Management Committee
14	Document Template Version History	CDSP
Appendix		
A1	Glossary of Key Terms	N/A

Section 1: Proposed Change

Please complete section 1 and 2 and specify within section 2 the output that is required from the CDSP

Originator Details			
Submitted By	Andrew Margan	Contact Number	07789 577327
		Email Address	andrew.margan@centrica.com
Customer Representative	David Addison	Contact Number	07428 559800
		Email Address	David.Addison@Xoserve.com
Subject Matter Expert/Network Lead	Bhupinder Basra	Contact Number	0121 623 2407
		Email Address	Bhupinder.Basra@xoserve.com
Customer Class		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper <input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input type="checkbox"/> iGT	
Overview of proposed change			
Change Details	<p><u>ONJOB submission:</u></p> <p>ONJOB Shipper validations shall ensure that one of the following conditions is satisfied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ONJOB transactions received from a User with a LI confirmation for the specified meter point; If a retrospective effective date is specified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It should be greater than the last reading if transfer reads are loaded. ○ If transfer reads are not loaded then it can be as early as when the confirmation was in CO status. ○ Amend the rule to allow for an update to have an effective date pre the CO status providing no other User has a confirmation at LI or CO on the effective date. <p><u>ONUPD submission:</u></p> <p>ONUPD RSU Validation shall ensure that one of the following conditions is satisfied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ONUPD transactions received from a User with a LI confirmation for the specified meter point. If a retrospective effective date is specified – within the APPNT and READG datasets – this must be within the Users ownership. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Amend the rule to allow for an update to have an effective date prior to the period of ownership providing no other User has a confirmation at LI or CO on the effective date. <p>Validations already in place for ONJOB and ONUPD files at RQ and CO stages of the confirmation period are to remain unchanged.</p> <p>The earliest allowable installation date should replicate the rules when carrying out an installation at RQ and CO status.</p>		
Reason(s) for proposed service change	<p>At present the RGMA validation rules do not allow for an asset update to be recorded pre D-2 of the confirmation effective date once the confirmation has progressed to this stage and cannot pre-date the confirmation effective date once the confirmation has gone live.</p>		

	Therefore, and particularly on first registration or a registration following an isolated period the Registered User cannot record the meter installation for the correct date (if the meter was installed prior to D of the confirmation effective date).
Status of related UNC Mod	N/A
Full title of related UNC Mod	N/A
Benefits of change	Ensures compliance with UNC G3 (MOD425 installations) and G7.3.7, asset installations on first registration.
Required Change Implementation Date	June 2018
Please provide an assessment of the priority of this change from the perspective of the industry.	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low Rationale for assessment: Should there be a delay to issuing of metering information, this could lead incorrect information being held on central systems. Providing all industry systems are maintained this change is not a priority, but given maintenance of industry data is a priority this change should not of low priority. Therefore, we have deemed the proposal to be medium priority and should be introduced as soon as reasonably possible.

Section 2: Initial Assessment / ROM Request / Change Proposal

Service Level of Quote/Estimate Robustness Requested	Evaluation Services <input type="checkbox"/> Initial Assessment (<i>Mod related changes only</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> ROM estimate for Analysis and Delivery CDSP Change Services <input type="checkbox"/> Firm Quote for Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Firm Quote for both Analysis and Delivery
Has any initial assessment been performed in support of this change?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No x

Is this considered to be a Priority Service Change?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Mod Related) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Legislation Change Related) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is this change considered to relate to a 'restricted class' of customers? <p style="color: purple; font-size: small;">Consider if the particular change is only likely to impact those who fall under a particular customer class</p> <p style="color: purple; font-size: small;">If it impacts all customer classes (i.e. Transmission, Distribution & Shippers) then choose 'No'.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (please mark the customer class(es) to whom this is restricted) <input type="checkbox"/> No <p style="text-align: center;">-----</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shippers <input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operators <input type="checkbox"/> iGT's
Is it anticipated that the change would have an adverse impact on customers of any other customer classes? <p style="color: purple; font-size: small;">Please refer to appendix one for the definition of an 'adverse impact'</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (please give details) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

General Service Changes Only (please ensure that either A or B below is completed)

<p>A) Customer view of impacted service area(s)</p> <p style="color: blue; font-size: small;">For a definition of the Service Areas, please see the 'Charge Base Apportionment Table' within the Budget and Charging Methodology. Please indicate the service area(s) that are understood to be impacted by the change. Please enter 'unknown' if relevant. Where the change is likely to impact more than one service area please indicate the percentage split of the impact across the impacted service areas. For example if it is split equally across two service areas then enter 50% in the 'split' against each service area.</p>
<p>B) If the change is anticipated to require the creation of a new service area and service line please give further details stating proposed name of new service area and title of service line:</p>

Specific Service Changes Only:
Please detail the proposed methodology (or amendment to the existing methodology) for determining Specific Service Change Charges.
Please detail the proposed basis (that is, Charging Measure and Charging Period) for determining Specific Service Change Charges in respect of the Specific Service.
Impacts to UKLink System or File Formats
No file format changes are required Change to UK Link validation rules for the RGMA file flow processing
Impacts UKL Manual Appendix 5b
N/A
Impacts to Gemini System
N/A
Please give any other relevant information.

Please send the document to the following:

Recipient	Email
Xoserve Portfolio Office	changeorders@xoserve.com
Change Management Committee Secretary	dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk

Section 3: ROM Request Acceptance

Is there sufficient detail within the ROM Request to enable a ROM Analysis to be produced?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If no, please define the additional details that are required.	

If the ROM Request is not accepted. Please forward this document to the Portfolio Office for onward transmission to the Change Management Committee

Section 4: ROM Analysis

This ROM is Xoserve's response to the above Evaluation Service Request. The response is intended to support customer involvement in the development of industry changes. Should the request obtain approval for continuance then a Change Proposal must be raised for any further analysis / development.

Disclaimer:

This ROM Analysis has been prepared in good faith by Xoserve Limited but by its very nature is only able to contain indicative information and estimates (including without limitation those of time, resource and cost) based on the circumstances known to Xoserve at the time of its preparation. Xoserve accordingly makes no representations of accuracy or completeness and any representations as may be implied are expressly excluded (except always for fraudulent misrepresentation).

Where Xoserve becomes aware of any inaccuracies or omissions in, or updates required to, this Report it shall notify the Network Operators' Representative as soon as reasonably practicable but Xoserve shall have no liability in respect of any such inaccuracy or omission and any such liability as may be implied by law or otherwise is expressly excluded.

This Report does not, and is not intended to; create any contractual or other legal obligation on Xoserve.

© 2017 Xoserve Ltd

All rights reserved.

ROM Analysis
<p>Change Assessment High level indicative assessment of the change on the CDSP service description, on UKLink and any alternative options if applicable</p>
<p>Change Impact: Initial assessment of whether the service change is / would have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a restricted class change, • a priority service change • an adverse impact on any customer classes
<p>Change Costs (implementation): An approximate estimate of the costs (or range of costs) where options are identified</p>
<p>Change Costs (on-going): The approximate estimate of the impact of the service change on service charges</p>
<p>Timescales: Details of timescale for the change i.e. 3months etc. Details of when Xoserve could start this change i.e. the earliest is release X.</p>
<p>Assumptions: Any key assumptions that have been made by Xoserve when providing the cost and or timescale</p>
<p>Dependencies: Any material dependencies of the implementation on any other service changes</p>

Constraints:

Any key constraints that are expected to impact the delivery of the service change

Please send the document to the following:

<i>Recipient</i>	<i>Email</i>
Xoserve Portfolio Office	changeorders@xoserve.com
Requesting Party	As specified in ROM Request

Section 5: Change Proposal: Committee Outcome

The Change Proposal is approved. An EQR is requested	Yes		
Approved Change Proposal version	1.0		
The change proposal shall not proceed	NA		
The committee votes to postpone its decision on the Change Proposal until a later meeting	NA	Date of later meeting	
The committee requires the proposer to make updates to the Change Proposal:	NA		

Updates required:

Section 6: Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Change Proposal Rejection

Change Proposal Rejection

	Yes		No	Is there sufficient detail within the Change Proposal to enable an EQR to be produced? If no, please provide further details below.
Further details required:				

Please send the document to the following:

<i>Recipient</i>	<i>Email</i>
Change Management Committee Secretary	dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk

Section 7: Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Notification of Delivery Date

Notification of EQR Delivery Date	
Original EQR delivery date:	
Revised EQR delivery date:	
Rationale for revision of delivery date:	

Please send the document to the following:

Recipient	Email
Change Management Committee Secretary	dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk

Section 8: Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR)

Project Manager		Contact Number	
		Email Address	
Project Lead		Contact Number	
		Email Address	

Please provide an indicative assessment of the impact of the proposed change on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. CDSP Service Description ii. CDSP Systems 	
Approximate timescale for delivery of 'business evaluation report' (N.b this is from the date on which the EQR is approved.)	
Estimated cost of business evaluation report preparation This can be expressed as a range of costs i.e. 'at least £xx,xxx but probably not more than £xx,xxx'.	
Does the CDSP agree with the 'Restricted class change' assessment (where provided)? Please refer to detail provided in the Change Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (please give detail below)
Does the CDSP agree with the 'Adverse Impact' assessment (where provided)? Please refer to detail provided in the Change Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (please give detail below)
Does the CDSP agree with the 'Priority Service Change' assessment (where provided)? Please refer to detail provided in the Change Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (please give detail below)
General service changes	
Does the CDSP agree with the assessment made in the Change Proposal regarding impacted service areas? This should refer to whether the proposing party	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (please give detail below)

<p>considers the service change to relate to an existing service area or whether it constitutes a new service area.</p>	
<p>Specific service changes</p>	
<p>Does the CDSP agree with the proposal made in the Change Proposal regarding specific change charges?</p> <p>This should refer to the proposed methodology (or amendment to existing methodology) for determining the specific service charges and the proposed basis for determining the specific service change charges.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (please give detail below)</p>
<p>Please provide a draft amendment of the Specific Service Change Charge Annex setting out the methodology for determining Specific Service Change Charges proposed in the Change Proposal</p>	
<p>EQR validity period:</p>	

Please send the document to the following:

Recipient	Email
Change Management Committee Secretary	dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk

Section 9: Evaluation Quotation Report: Committee Outcome

The EQR is approved			
Approved EQR version			
The Change Proposal shall not proceed. The Change Proposal and this EQR shall lapse			
The committee votes to postpone its decision on the EQR until a later meeting		Date of later meeting	
The committee requires updates to the EQR:			
Updates required:			
General service changes only			
<i>(The detail upon which the response will be based is originally defined in the change proposal and potentially commented upon in the subsequent EQR)</i>			
1.) Does the committee agree with the assessment of the service area(s) to which the service line belongs and the weighting of the impact?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
2.) If no, please enter the agreed service area(s) and the weighting:			
Specific service changes only			
<i>(The detail upon which the response will be based is originally defined in the Change Proposal and potentially commented upon in the subsequent EQR)</i>			
1.) Please confirm the methodology for the determination of Specific Service Change charges			
2.) Please confirm the charging measure and charging period for the determination of Specific Service Change charges			

Section 10: Business Evaluation Report (BER)

Change Implementation Detail

1.) Detail changes required to the CDSP Service Description

2.) Detail modifications required to UK Link

3.) Detail changes required to appendix 5b of the UK Link Manual

4.) Detail impact on operating procedures and resources of the CDSP

5.) Implementation Plan

6.) Estimated implementation costs

6a.) How will the charging for the costs be allocated to different customer classes?
(General Service Changes only)

Please mark % against each customer class:

- | | |
|--|--|
| | National Grid Transmission |
| | Distribution Network Operators and IGT's |
| | DN Operator |
| | IGT's |
| | Shippers |

100%

7.) Estimated impact of the service change on service charges

8.) Please detail any pre-requisite activities that must be completed by the customer prior to receiving or being able to request the service.

Implementation Options

Please provide details on any alternative solution/implementation options:

This should include:

- (i) a description of each Implementation Option;
- (ii) the advantages and disadvantages of each option
- (iii) the CDSP preferred Implementation Option

--

Restricted Class Changes only

Is there any change in the view of the CDSP on whether there would be an 'Adverse Impact' on customers outside the relevant customer class(es)?

Yes (please give detail below)

No

Dependencies:

--

Constraints:

--

Benefits:

--

Impacts:

--

Risks:

--

Assumptions:
Information Security:
Out of scope:
Please provide any additional information relevant to the proposed service change:

Please send the document to the following:

Recipient	Email
Change Management Committee Secretary	dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk

Section 11: Business Evaluation Report: Committee Outcome

The BER is approved and the change can proceed		
Modification Changes Only Please ensure that the Transporters are formally informed of the Target Implementation Date		
Approved BER version		
The change proposal shall not proceed and the BER shall lapse		
The committee votes to postpone its decision on the BER until a later meeting		Date of later meeting
The committee requires updates to the BER:		
Updates required:		

Section 12: Change Completion Report (CCR)

Change Overview

Please include detail on the following for the chosen implementation option: modifications to UKLink, impact on operating procedures and resources of the CDSP.
 Actions required of the customer prior to the commencement date

Please detail any differences between the solution that was implemented and what was defined in the BER.

Detail the revised text of the CDSP Service Description reflecting the change that has been made

Were there any revisions to the text of the UK Link Manual?

- Yes (please insert the revised text of the UK Link manual below)
 No

Proposed Commencement Date		Actual Commencement Date	
-------------------------------	--	-----------------------------	--

Please provide an explanation of any variance

Please detail the main lessons learned from the project

Service change costs			
Approved Costs (£)		Actual Costs (£)	
Reasons for variance between approved and actual costs:			

Please send the document to the following:

Recipient	Email
Change Management Committee Secretary	enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk

Section 13: Change Completion Report: Committee Outcome

The implementation is complete and the CCR is approved		
Approved CCR version		
The committee votes to postpone its decision on the CCR until a later meeting		Date of later meeting:
The committee requires further information		
Further information required:		
The committee considers that the implementation is not complete		
Further action(s) required:		
The proposed changes to the CDSP Service Description or UK Link Manual are not correct		
Amendments to CDSP service description / UKLink manual required:		

Section 14: Document Template Version History

The purpose of this section is to keep a record of the changes to the overall version template and the individual sections within. It will be updated by the CDSP following approval of the template update by the Change Management Committee.

Version History:

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
1.0	Approved		CDSP	Version Approved by Change Committee

--- END OF DOCUMENT ---

Appendix One: Glossary

Term	Definition
Adverse Impact	<p>A Service Change has or would have an Adverse Impact on Customers of a particular Customer Class if:</p> <p>(a) Implementing the Service Change would involve a modification of UK Link which would conflict with the provision of existing Services for which such Customer Class is a Relevant Customer Class;</p> <p>(b) the Service Change would involve the CDSP disclosing Confidential Information relating to such Customers to Customers of another Customer Class or to Third Parties;</p> <p>(c) Implementing the Service Change would conflict to a material extent with the Implementation of another Service Change (for which such Customer Class is a Relevant Customer Class) with an earlier Proposal Date and which remains Current, unless the Service Change is a Priority Service Change which (under the Priority Principles) takes priority over the other Proposed Service Change; or</p> <p>(d) Implementing the Service Change would have an Adverse Interface Impact for such Customers.</p>
General Service	A service provided under the DSC to Customers or Customers of a Customer Class on a uniform basis.
Non-Priority Service Change	A Service Change which is not a Priority Service Change
Priority Service Change	<p>A Modification Service Change;</p> <p>or</p> <p>A Service Change in respect of a Service which allows or facilitates compliance by a Customer or Customers with Law or with any document designated for the purposes of Section 173 of the Energy Act 2004 (including any such Law or document or change thereto which has been announced but not yet made).</p>
Relevant Customer class	A Customer Class is a Relevant Customer Class in relation to a Service or a Service Change where Service Charges made or to be made in respect of such Service, or the Service subject to such Service Change, are or will be payable by Customers of that Customer Class
Restricted Class Change	Where, in relation to a Service Change, not all Customer Classes are Relevant Customer Classes, the Service Change is a Restricted Class Change ;
Service Change	<p>A change to a Service provided under the DSC (not being an Additional Service), including:</p> <p>(i) the addition of a new Service or removal of an existing Service; and</p> <p>(ii) in the case of an existing Service, a change in any feature of the Service specified in the CDSP Service Description, and any related change to the CDSP Service Description</p>
Specific Service	A service (other than Additional Services) available under the DSC to all Customer or Customers of a Customer Class but provided to a particular Customer only upon the order of the Customer.

Appendix Two: Consultation Responses

As per the request at the Change Management Committee meeting on the 13th December 2017 this change was issued for consultation across the industry. The consultation closed on the 28th December 2017. The comments received will form the basis of discussion at the Change Management Committee on 10th January 2018 to approve or reject the change.

The following two comments were received:

User	Name	Date	User Comments
EDF Energy	Elly Laurence	22/12/17	We are uncomfortable with the proposal around Meter Asset Installation Date. This feels like a proposal that is linked to Retrospective Asset style updates and until there is a firm decision around the Retro Asset process going forward we would suggest this type of change should not be considered as it would compromise some of that logic.
Scottish Power	Shane Preston	27/12/17	We support to this change to ensure compliance and accuracy.
NPower	Maitrayee Bhowmick-Jewkes	28/12/17	This change is to allow submission and acceptance of RGMA flows in the 2 days between TRF (CO) and actual SSD (LI) and we have no real issue with it. However, seeing that the current process seems to be working without any problems, we don't see why we would want to change how things are at the moment.